

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly from November through April by St. Louis University College of Arts and Sciences at Florissant, Mo.
 Subscription price: \$2.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter at Florissant, Mo. Post-Office under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. 24

DECEMBER 1947

No. 2

Obsecratio

ad Iesum Infantem in praesepio positum

O Iesu mitis et clemens, praesepio
 Qui natus es, humillimis cunabulis,
 Vocaris Princeps Pacis. Pacem condito.

Beata Mater, ecce virgo, parvulum
 Te arridet, dum circumstant muta animalia
 Gaudentia portento, cum stella tres Magi
 Splendente ducti, te venerandi gratia
 Pastores et se conferunt, choro angelum
 Ducente, ad incunabula Pacis Principis.
 Miserere nostri, Iesu. Pacem condito.

Herodes, rex immitis, regno suo timens,
 Iudaeis nam esse regem natum audiverat,
 Interrogat Magos, dum caedem cogitat,
 Ubi Infans inveniatur. Et simul imperat
 Annuntient Puerum, fieta reverentia,
 Qui pacem largietur affectantibus.
 At hi discedunt clam, monente somnio,
 Ne rex Herodes inferat huic iniuriam,
 Onus imposituro humeris fatale et asperum,
 Laturo principatum nostra gratia.
 Salvator Iesu, perge, mitis et clemens,
 Operari principatum. O pacem condito.

O Iesu mitis et clemens, populo tuo
 Agitato furiis, O propere succurrito.
 Amentiam averrunca a nobis Russicam,
 Nam Herodes alter insidias tetras parat,
 Vexillum sanguineum proponens horridum,
 Sceleraque nefanda perpetrans populo tuo.
 Es natus Princeps Pacis. Pacem condito.

Splendescat stella denuo in caelis tua,
 Arcensens Christicolae, Pastores et Magos,
 Ad mala abigenda. Iesu, parce subditis,
 Debella nunc furentis. Pacem condito.

BONAMICUS ACTENSIS
 mense Aprili MCMXLVII
 scripsit.

As no builder has built like the Greeks, so no writer has written like the Greeks. In edge, in delicacy, in proportion, in accuracy of effect, they are as marble to our sandstone. The perfection of the Greek vehicle is what attacks the mind of the modern man and gives him dreams.—John Jay Chapman.

From the time of its appearance the Aeneid has stayed what it is and will permanently be—the European masterpiece of deliberate as distinguished from spontaneous poetry.—Barrett Wendell

Aims and Methods of Latin Teaching¹

By B. L. ULLMAN

University of North Carolina

Many years ago, long before the Classical Investigation, I published a little pamphlet with essentially the same title as that borne by this paper. Though I have changed my views on many things, I hold fast to the fundamental thesis of that pamphlet, the obvious but often overlooked principle that teaching methods should be determined by aims, or objectives, if you prefer that term. Objectives, in turn, should be determined by values. Now values are essentially the same as one group of objectives, except that the term 'values' is used from the pupil's standpoint, 'objectives' from the teacher's. In this paper I shall limit myself to a brief discussion of three objectives.

Let us deal first with discipline, that is, the development of certain mental habits and qualities. Since the outbreak of the war and the training of our army there has been much criticism of our schools for failure to produce discipline and disciplined minds. Whether this is due to the emphasis on child-centered education, as some maintain, need not concern us here. The fact remains that, whatever the general educational theory or specific method behind it, Latin is still a disciplinary subject. I have never given up my belief in the disciplinary value of Latin, though I have felt it desirable at times to play down that aspect and to use other terminology. I have always been convinced that all the talk about and against mental discipline was just a silly quarrel in semantics. Discipline by any other name smells just as sweet. Psychologists and educators, those among them who really know their subjects, now admit it. Whether you call it discipline or transfer of training, it is real. To deny this is to deny education itself. What, apart from the three R's, is education except transfer of training? Essentially education is discipline, and it is surprising that anyone has failed to realize that fact. If the American people were not such fanatical believers in education, they would long ago have pointed out to educators the inconsistency in arguing against disciplinary values while at the same time asking for twelve grades and more of public education for every child. Only those who are for very narrow vocational training can consistently argue against discipline.

Latin is a particularly good discipline because to learn it requires that we observe grammatical forms, in two senses of the word "observe;" we must notice them, become aware of them and their differences, and then we must observe them in the sense of respecting them and giving each his due, rendering unto *Caesaris* that which is *Caesar's*, not giving to the ending *-um* what belongs to *-o*, nor to *-bus* that which is the function of *-es*. The

beauty of Latin, then, is that the discipline is largely automatic. To be sure, there are ways of lessening and increasing it. A completely direct method, whether oral or reading, tends to lessen it; the old-fashioned, rigorous grammatical method tends to emphasize it. In the interest of other objectives, however, we must compromise and not become too old-fashioned.

As to two other objectives that I think are highly important, my thesis is that instead of talking about the values of Latin we should do something to make sure that pupils get them.

First, we must remember that we Latin teachers are teachers of English. We teach our pupils almost all the English grammar they know. That again is partly automatic, though I think that it is our responsibility to correct and explain and prevent English errors. For example, the problem of *who* and *whom* can easily be explained when the Latin relative is studied. Pupils then will understand the difference between *who* and *whom*, and some of them will apply their knowledge. Our whole approach in the teaching of Latin grammar should be to associate it with English grammar, to present the two together. At times the similarities are to be pointed out; at other times, the differences.

But we also teach English vocabulary. No one thing is a better index of intelligence than vocabulary. Psychologists admit that the best intelligence tests are based on vocabulary. Bagley has noted that in the development of intelligence tests during the last thirty years, vocabulary tests had the highest correlation with the combined results of all single tests. The bigger our vocabulary, the better we think. It is true that thoughts produce words, but words also produce thoughts. It is, of course, true that we increase our English vocabularies by reading and hearing English. Some people have achieved a fine English style and a large vocabulary by these means alone, as for example Abraham Lincoln. But most of us benefit by other procedures as well, and particularly by the analysis of English words in the Latin class. Why is this so? Because English is, in one sense, regardless of what books on the English language may say, a Romance language, a modern form of Latin.

Very briefly, here are the things that we are doing or should be doing. First, we have the problem of making the pupil derivative-conscious, so that he will get into the habit of seeing the English derivatives in Latin words or the Latin words behind English derivatives. Like a baby trying to walk, he will often stumble and fall. We need to guide him, encourage him, warn him. His mistakes will be ludicrous, but we must not laugh at them. He will want to derive English *post* from Latin *post* just because they are spelled the same way, and will even give you a fanciful explanation when you ask him why he connects Latin *cur* and English *cur*. He will think that *petimus* means "we pet." Simple English words, thoroughly familiar to all students, are useful for developing the habit of associating Latin and English; words like *firm* (*firmus*), *fact* (*facio*), *library* (*liber*). Then there must be detailed teaching of prefixes and suffixes in both Latin and English words. Vowel changes must not be neglected, and some of these fall into simple rules, as in Latin *recipio* and English *recipient* from *re* and *capio*. What I have in mind, then, is word-formation, both Latin and English, developed in connection

with the reading material of the textbook. Let the pupils find derivatives of as many Latin words as possible. Let them bring their new and difficult English words to the Latin class for dissection. You can have a word laboratory every week or two in order to examine under a microscope, so to speak, the words that pupils have previously submitted in writing.

The Latin teacher has a great opportunity for service by cooperating with teachers of other subjects in the study of the technical terms of those subjects, terms which are largely Latin or Greek in origin. It is not always realized, though it has been demonstrated by careful investigations, that an understanding of the terminology of a subject is an important factor in achieving success therein.

An inexhaustible field is that of particularly interesting derivatives. Especially important are words that become prominent for one reason or another, as today *fissionable*, *inflation*, *subsidies*, *substantive*. It should be remembered that there is useful work to be done with words that are supposedly familiar to students. It is not true that one either knows a word or doesn't. We all of us have a graded vocabulary, i. e., the vocabulary scale is a long one with almost infinite gradations from the low C of absolute ignorance to the high C of intimate familiarity. How many words do you know well enough to caress fondly, to linger over lovingly, to sense their innermost thoughts, prejudices, complexes, all of which are the product of their family history? The importance of words can hardly be overestimated. As Tennyson put it:

"For words, like Nature, half reveal
And half conceal the Soul within."

Can we Latin teachers really improve our pupils' English? That is one thing of which we can be absolutely sure. Of all the tests given to Latin pupils none are more reliable, more often tried, more convincing than those which aim to determine whether Latin pupils do better in English words than non-Latin pupils with the same IQ.

Latin teachers are not only good English teachers; they are good social science teachers. The keenest minds everywhere realized that the recent war was a fight not only to save ourselves from destruction but also to preserve what we call Western civilization, which means in large measure the ideas of Greece and Rome, as transmitted to us through the ages by the Latin language.

Mussolini made his great mistake in trying to restore the Roman Empire on a physical plane. The name of Fascism and its trappings, the huge marble maps on the walls of the Basilica of Maxentius in Rome, showing the growth of the ancient Roman Empire and of its would-be modern counterpart, are concrete expressions of that error. He did not seem to realize that the Roman Empire still exists, in a cultural sense, in our common Western civilization, and that a material re-creation of it was for that very reason impossible. Physically the Roman Empire is dead and its immortal spirit is unwilling to return to the corpse. As someone has said: "When we think of Europe . . . as a particular kind of culture or civilization, we are basically thinking of Rome. When we speak of a European as distinct from, say, a Chinese, we are really speaking of a Roman." We classics teachers are the standard bearers of Western

civilization. An educationist, not a Latinist, writing in the *School Review* a few years ago under the title "The Education of the Post-War Generation," stated that we live in a time of crisis, that forces are at work to reduce the species *homo sapiens* to a new species, *homo mechanicus*. These forces he associated with dictatorships and the Nazi philosophy, which would make slaves of all except a small number of leaders. Among the suggestions the writer made to prevent such a development in this country is the teaching of Latin, as the purveyor of our common Western civilization. This is a thought with which we all agree, but whether any considerable body of educators can be convinced of the desirability of such a program is another matter.

In these days everyone is talking about the Founding Fathers and their contribution to the making of our nation. But where did the Fathers get their ideas? From their reading of Greek and Roman literature and history. Almost every one of them was well versed in ancient lore. Jefferson is a particularly good example, but he by no means stands alone. I need not remind you that our tripartite division of governmental functions among executive, legislative, and judicial departments is based on Polybius's approving description of the Roman commonwealth. It is no accident that Washington was called the father of his country. Remember Cicero, *pater patriae*. And these are but two of countless examples. Going back to the Founding Fathers necessitates another step—returning to the Latin and Greek classics.

The recent war will soon be forgotten by new generations of students, but while it is still discussed in the newspapers and magazines, let us note the ideas and places which suggest a connection with antiquity. Places in northern Africa, Italy, France, and elsewhere that were mentioned in the newspapers during the war were familiar to our pupils from the pictures in our textbooks. News reports told of the occupation of Cannae by our troops. Shades of Hannibal! When a reporter thinks it news worth cabling that Horace's birthplace, Venusia, an insignificant little town today, was captured, then we know and we should make our students realize that Horace *was* somebody. If they won't believe us, they will believe the papers. They have plenty to see by the papers, and should be urged to bring in clippings from them and from such magazines as *Life*. Some ancient monuments have been destroyed or damaged. They include the House of the Faun and the Museum at Pompeii. Rome has been largely spared. The destruction at Pompeii and elsewhere pained us as much as it did anyone, just as the sparing of Rome filled us with gratitude. The important point is that the monuments of Italy belong to us quite as much as they belong to the Italians—more so if one can judge by the number of Americans and English who visited them in peacetime as compared with the Italians. These monuments and ruins are part of that Western civilization that we have tried to save. They link us to our past. We talk much of internationalism, and that is fine, but I want to coin a word and speak of "intertemporalism." Every age should keep its ties with the past, even as it builds for the future. Civilization is no new creation; it is an edifice built slowly on old, even crumbling, foundations, on the damaged House of the Faun at Pompeii or the bombed church of Saint Lorenzo at Rome.

But Rome is not merely in Italy; it is all about us. Wherever we turn we come to a road that leads straight back to ancient Rome. There are the many Latin inscriptions, quotations, and mottoes. The motto of the air corps is *ut viri volent*. The technical schools of the air corps use *sustineo alas*. The classics find their way into the movies and the comic strips, into advertising circulars and telephone directories. Classical designs, mouldings, and insignia are found everywhere, as on coins and postage stamps. You can make a large and imposing collection of stamps bearing Latin inscriptions, pictures of Greek and Roman buildings, ruins, and sculpture, classical motifs of various sorts.

There are classical buildings in Finland and New Zealand, in Manila and Buenos Aires. One touch of ancient Rome makes the whole world kin. Our national capital at Washington is full of beautiful buildings in classical style, from Capitol Hill to the White House and beyond. The Supreme Court sits in a handsome Roman temple. The majestic simplicity of the Doric style of the Lincoln Memorial harmonizes with the simplicity of Lincoln's character. Very appropriately the Jefferson Memorial is a copy of his home at Monticello, which he modelled after a Roman temple. Our state Capitols, our banks, our memorials, our arches are often classical in design because Thomas Jefferson and others of the Founding Fathers were fond of this style, as they were of all things classical.

All that I have asked you to do is to teach Latin and English and the civilization of the Roman Empire and its influence on the modern world. You think that is a rather large order? Remember that you are the flour of the wheat, the *crème de la crème*. For the National Teacher Examination given in 1940 to teachers and prospective teachers of all subjects showed that the Latin teachers were superior to the rest. They not only did better in their own subject than the teachers of other subjects did in theirs, but their median score in general culture was 66 as against 62 of all the teachers. They surpassed all the other teachers in English comprehension, expression, and literature, making a better score than the English teachers themselves. Is it any wonder that I suggested that you have large responsibilities in the teaching of English? You recall Virgil's *Possunt quia posse videntur*. There is a corollary to that, which we might phrase *Agunt quia possunt*. The future of Latin is in your hands.

¹ Part of an address given at the Foreign Language Conference at Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana, May 4, 1946.

Cicero, *de Amicitia* 7.23: an Analysis.

If those who teach the *De Amicitia* will from time to time stop long enough to ask a student what the paragraph he has just translated *means*, they will often discover that between translation and understanding there is a great gulf fixed. This, which is always more or less true, is particularly so of the *De Amicitia* which is often highly condensed and highly allusive in its character. Chapter 7, section 23, will be a good place to experiment. It is rather astonishing, by the way, how even Seyffert, the assumed master-commentator on the *De Amicitia*, maunders along at this point with remarks

which are not very helpful to an understanding of why the text is what it is. Shuckburgh errs in the other direction by saying nothing in effect about the passage in his commentary.

"Friendship embraces a number of advantages of very considerable value, but preeminently that of sending a ray of good hope down the future and of not permitting spirits to be undermined and succumb." The proof for that statement is obviously presented in the *enim* sentence following: "for the person who fixes his gaze on a genuine friend, is fixing it as it were (*tamquam*) on a kind of (*aliquod*) model from which he himself is derived." Why is that such a great help in life? The next (*quocirca*) sentence will tell us: "because of this friends, though actually separated, enjoy each other's presence; the need of the one is met from the resources of the other; the weakness of the one is compensated for by the strength of the other. I will show you something yet harder to maintain: the one in death survives through the other. So great is the respect, the loving recollection, the sense of loss in the friends who remain attending on those who have gone before, that as a result the death of these latter takes on the aspect of a benediction, and the life of the former that of a glory." The point is that, as model and reproduction, mould and casting, fit the one with the other at every point with complete accuracy, thus likewise do the characters and the fortunes of true friends; absence meets presence, poverty riches, weakness strength, death life, in such a way that they are absolutely complementary in the persons of two friends. There is no line of cleavage, no failure to conjoin properly, when the surface of the one partner in friendship is applied to that of the other partner.

For the purpose of the above argument it does not matter whether oneself is the mould or the casting, the model or the reproduction. From whichever end the fitting or matching occurs, it will be a perfect fit or match. However it should be pointed out that in Cicero *exemplar* is always used for the basic pattern to which a thing is cut, the mould to which it is shaped, and not to the derived reproduction or casting. This will be seen by reference to Merguet's lexicons for the oratorical and the philosophical works. Hence the proper translation in the second sentence of our passage is not "second version of himself" but "the pattern, as it were, to which he himself is cut." Pliny gives us the helpful commentary on this when he writes *Epp. 1.20.9: est enim oratio actionis exemplar et quasi archetypon*.

As for the *Letters*, according to the *Index* for the vocabulary of Cicero's *Epistles* by Oldfather, Cantor, and Abbott (Urbana, 1938), the word *exemplar* occurs only three times in that range. Once it is used by Asinius Pollio (*Ad Fam. 10.31.6*), and once by Plancus (*Ad Fam. 10.21.3*), both times in the sense of "copy" of a letter. Apparently Cicero also uses it in this sense, thus departing for once from his otherwise uniform usage, in *Ad Att. 4.5.1*, but Oldfather's *Index* notes (p. 49) the conjecture of L. A. Constans (*Cicéron, Correspondance*, Paris, 1935) *exempla duo* (i. e. *exempla ii*) for the ms. *exemplar*, which has every appearance of being a sound correction, if the context of the letter is regarded.

Finally, let the student be referred, after the above

explication de texte has been given, to Shuckburgh's splendid translation of the passage as found in the Harvard Classics, Vol. 9 (P. F. Collier and Son, 1909, New York). Then *De Amicitia* 7.23 will take on not only new meaning but a new glory as the haunting apostolic sentence rings in our instructed ears: *quasi morientes et ecce vivimus*. (2 Cor. 6.9).

University of California,
Berkeley.

WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER

"Gadflies," Ancient and Modern

ERNEST POLETTE, C.P.
Normandy, Mo.

"Gadfly of the Railroads: Robert R. Young."¹ This rather peculiar caption headlined an article in a recent issue of the *Readers' Digest*. A few weeks later an article appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* entitled, "San Francisco Gadfly."²

It seems a far cry from the ancient Greek philosopher, Socrates, to our stream-lined twentieth century. Yet, knowingly or not, the authors of the two articles mentioned above, hark back to a figure of speech used by Socrates. The Athenian jurors who attended the trial of Socrates on that morning in 399 B. C. heard the following words:

And now, Athenians, I am not going to argue for my own sake, as you may think, but for yours, that you may not sin against the god by condemning me, who am his gift to you. For if you kill me you will not easily find a successor to me, who, if I may use such a ludicrous figure of speech, am a sort of gadfly, given to the state by God; and the state is a great and noble steed who is tardy in his motions owing to his very size, and requires to be stirred into life. I am that gadfly which God has attached to the state, and all day long and in all places am always fastening upon you, arousing and persuading and reproaching you. You will not easily find another like me, and therefore I would advise you to spare me. I dare say that you may feel out of temper (like a person who is suddenly awakened from sleep), and you think that you might easily strike me dead, as Anytus advises, and then you would sleep on for the remainder of your lives, unless God in his care of you sent you another gadfly.³

Lexicons, in general, define a gadfly simply as a horse-fly, or a large fly that torments cattle. Such was the somewhat ridiculous comparison Socrates employed in explaining to his jurors his function in the political and social life of ancient Athens. Socrates considered himself as a sort of divinely-directed goad whose duty it was to arouse the Athenians from their ignorance and spur them on to the attainment of true knowledge and genuine virtue.

In justifying Mr. Robert R. Young's claim to the title of 'Gadfly of the Railroads,' the author states that the dream trains of the future, as pictured in some advertisements, will undoubtedly come true. But they might have lagged into the next decade . . .

if it had not been for that self-constituted goad and gadfly of the railroads, Robert R. Young of the Chesapeake and Ohio. White-haired Mr. Young, chairman of the board of the C & O, is all out for every possible railroad improvement. . . . From legible time-tables to electronically cooked foods for day-coach tray service, from gas-turbine locomotives to train-to-shore telephones, the 135-pound bundle of banty rooster nervous energy that is Bob Young has been busy pushing them all.⁴

In justification of the title "San Francisco Gadfly," we read that this human gadfly is Mr. J. C. Geiger, sixty-one-year-old . . . bald, husky doctor with a Gar-

gantuan appetite for obstacles, publicity, and the emotional excitement of his job. For the past sixteen years, as the people's doctor in San Francisco, uninhibited Doctor Geiger has been selling his brand of public health in the manner of a circus barker, on the theory that most people need constant prodding to make them guard their health."⁵

These men are impelled by their desire to serve the public interest, the public welfare. Socrates' gadfly activities resulted, as he relates, from a reply which the god Apollo made to a question put to him at his shrine at Delphi. Chaerephon, an intimate friend of Socrates, asked the god who was the wisest man in the world. The Delphic oracle replied that Socrates was the wisest man in the world.

Socrates, famous for a sense of humor and the fitness of things, set out to prove the oracle wrong by finding some one wiser than himself. In the end, after long and earnest investigation, he was forced to admit that the reply of Apollo was true in a certain sense: no man, he concluded was truly wise, but he himself was superior to the rest of mankind in that he was not wise and knew it, whereas they were not wise and yet thought that they were. He therefore regarded the words of the oracle as a direct command to spend his life in trying to make his fellow-men realize for themselves what he had discovered in his own case, and abandon their pretensions to wisdom, for until they had done so, he held that they could not aspire to true wisdom or true knowledge. He freely criticized their ideas, their actions, and their institutions, and thus he resembled many of the leaders of the new thought, but with this difference, that while they criticized from sheer love of destruction, he destroyed in order to obtain a solid foundation on which to rebuild.⁶

Were Socrates living today, he would without doubt be writing a syndicated column for some newspaper-chain, perhaps broadcasting his home-spun philosophy to interested listeners. But Socrates has modern counterparts, men who might qualify as 'gadflies,' men who seek to arouse the consciences of leaders of states as well as of individual citizens. George Sokolsky, the columnist readily comes to mind. Here is a writer who "suffers no restraint from criticism and is independent of outside control."⁷ Fearlessly and without partiality he inveighs against corruption in the high places of politics. His demand for precise definition and clear thinking rebukes the shallow mouthings of many modern news analysts and commentators. Sokolsky, like Socrates of old, is fond of asking questions; questions which often go unanswered because logical, consistent replies would betray the insincerity or cowardice of so-called molders of public opinion. Against modern advocates of race suicide, Sokolsky is old-fashioned enough to insist upon personal morality and the sanctity of the home and family.

Millions of Americans Sunday after Sunday during the winter season turn their dials to the Catholic Hour, in order to hear Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen. These millions, I am sure, would reverently accord the eloquent Monsignor the title of "God's Gadfly." For in a voice which somehow transmits its sincerity over the air waves, this brilliant philosopher points out the errors current in America and the world at large, and then, guided by reason and his deep spirit of faith, he suggests the remedies necessary to heal a nation and a world morally and mentally diseased.

We could add many others to this brief list of modern Socratic 'gadflies,' e. g., the plain-spoken and fearless writers who pen the editorials of the Catholic weekly, "America," or the militant head of "The Catholic World,"

Father Gillis. In the tradition of the sage who drank the hemlock in the prison at Athens, these men and others like them seek to arouse their fellowmen to the dangers which threaten our Christian heritage. What one modern 'gadfly,' Father Gillis, says of another 'gadfly,' George Sokolsky, may well sum up the important role these men fill in our modern world: "If there were others in sufficient numbers who would speak out as boldly as he and with as holy a recklessness of personal consequences we might still save all worth saving in America and in the world."⁸

¹ *Readers' Digest*: May, 1947, pp. 34-38. Condensed from *Life*: February 24, 1947.

² *Saturday Evening Post*: June 7, 1947. "San Francisco Gadfly" by Dean Jennings.

³ *The Works of Plato*. Selected and Edited by Irwin Edman, p. 76. Translation by Benjamin Jowett.

⁴ Loc. cit. *Readers' Digest*.

⁵ Loc. cit. *Saturday Evening Post*.

⁶ *The Martyrdom of Socrates*. Edited by F. C. Doherty. Introduction, p. 11-12.

⁷ *The Sign*: December, 1944. "Why I Like Sokolsky," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P.

⁸ Loc. cit. *The Sign*.

Christmas Hymn

Traditional

The snow was on the ground,
The stars shone bright,
When Christ our Lord was born
On Christmas night.

Venite, adoremus Dominum (bis).

'Twas Mary Virgin mild
Of Holy Ann,
That brought into this world
The God made Man.

Venite, adoremus Dominum (bis).

VERSION

Χιὼν ἔκειτ' ἀγροῖσιν,
ἔφαινε λάμπρὰ τάστρα,
ὅτε Κύριος κατήλθε
νύκτωρ Γενεθλοῖσιν.

"Ἴτε δεῦρο, προσκυνῶμεν Κύριον (δῖς).

Μαριάμ κόρη τέρεινα,
"Αννης ἀγνῆς ἐκφῶσα,
ἐγείνατ' εἰς ἀνθρώπους
Θεὸν βροτὸν γεγῶτα.

"Ἴτε δεῦρο, προσκυνῶμεν Κύριον (δῖς).

F. A. P.

The *Classical Club of St. Louis* has chosen as the theme of its discussions during the present scholastic year "The Literature of Entertainment," and will present programmes on Greek and Roman Comedy and Romances. The January meeting, however, will discuss the new plan for the study of Virgil in second year high school, as sponsored by the Committee on Educational Policies of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South.

Spina etiam grata est, ex qua exspectatur rosa.

—*Publius Syrus*

The Classical Bulletin

EDITORIAL STAFF

Francis A. Preuss, S.J.	Managing Editor
Hugo J. Gerleman, S.J.	Associate Editor
Aloysius A. Jacobsmeyer, S.J.	Book Reviews
Charles A. Collier, S.J.	Correspondence, Manuscripts
Arthur F. Hoogstraet, S.J.	Business Editor

All of the faculty of St. Louis University College
of Arts and Sciences at Florissant, Mo.

Address: THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN, FLORISSANT, MO.

About subscriptions, renewals, books, pamphlets, etc., address the Business Editor. Submit all MS for publication to the Correspondence Editor.

Vol. 24

December 1947

No. 2

Editorial

The "Great Books" idea, since it was first broached at St. John's College less than ten years ago, has taken root rapidly in many quarters. Not only has Annapolis found imitators and emulators of its whole system of liberal education, but a number of colleges have adopted some form or other of the great books programme in their honors courses leading to the A. B. degree, whilst others have sponsored various adult-education programmes or discussion circles in cooperation with the Great Books Foundation of Chicago.

The movement to bring modern America back to the roots and sources of what is most precious and abiding in its own culture is deserving of the highest commendation. Few movements in modern education have been more rationally grounded and more full of promise. Why not, indeed, imbibe the great ideas that lie at the basis of Western civilization at the fountain-head—in the greatest works of the greatest minds of the world? Or why waste the precious formative years of a talented young man's life on the ephemeral fads and fancies of the hour, on the *little* books of *little* minds, or even on books about books, when the eternal classics of the race—the masterpieces that have made our world, shaped our ideas, crystallized our aspirations, changed the course of history itself for centuries—are forever there to be contemplated, appropriated, assimilated by whosoever will approach them with the reverence, read them with the attention, and study them with the long and patient application which they deserve and demand?

But there's the rub! The great books—as, for instance, the New Testament, the Organon of Aristotle, the Republic of Plato, the Iliad of Homer, the History of Thucydides, the Aeneid of Virgil, the Divina Commedia of Dante, the Summa of St. Thomas—are decidedly not amusement for an idle hour. How often have we met people whom superficial dipping into one or other of them has profited nothing! How often even such as cursory reading in translations has prejudiced against them, and so done positive harm! Great masterpieces must be *studied*—they must be *lived*. They are there to be contemplated, appropriated, assimilated. And that requires time, hard work, intellectual travail. But it requires even more than that: it requires intelligence, maturity, or, at least, the discipline of a thorough preparation.

aration.

To profit by the reading of the great books, then, an immature collegian needs solid preparation, mature direction on the part of one really competent to give it, long and hard study with much testing and much discussion. Hence, to assign a dozen or more great books for reading and study in a single semester, is just about to defeat the whole purpose of the scheme. To allow, or even encourage, unprepared young minds to wrestle with the giant intellects of all time without adequate and expert direction, is to risk befuddling and misleading them, and stunting instead of fostering their intellectual and spiritual growth. We would not, of course, maintain that to read Homer and Plato in a good translation is a sheer waste of time. But translations are often dangerous things, both because they give so imperfect an interpretation of the original (especially in the case of great works of the imagination), and because their reading comes too easy to the student and hence may betray him into every kind of superficiality. If translations of the great books *must* be used, at least the director of the course and leader in the discussions ought to be thoroughly conversant with the original; else the whole class or group may easily go far astray.

Ideal conditions for the study of one of the great books of Greece or Rome would be a humanist classical scholar of very broad interests as guide, a small, intelligent class, sufficiently trained in Latin and Greek to follow readily an *explication-de-texte* based on the original, and several months of lectures, discussion-seminars, and tutorials to master the work as a whole and in its parts. If conditions are less favorable than this, training of a superior kind can hardly be hoped for from a reading of the great books. If conditions do not even remotely approach these, it may be questioned whether a venture into the deep sea of the great books may not prove unrewarding, futile, or even hazardous.

F. A. P.

Mr. Goodwin Beach, alias *Bonamicus Actensis*, the Treasurer of the American Philological Association and President of the *Societas Latine Loquendi*, who last May published a sympathetic and most interesting study of the poems of Leo XIII in *Folia* (II.2.64-75), appears in the Christmas *Obsecratio* that leads off our present issue as a worthy emulator of the great pontiff's Latin Muse. It is when the classical languages become for us once more living tongues in which we feel completely at home, that they exert their fullest and finest influence. As a rule too, it is only then that the masterpieces of antiquity are adequately understood and appreciated. Could not this high goal be set, even in our day, at least for those who major in the classics in college, and above all, for those who aspire to the classics as a profession? How much more satisfying to both student and instructor would not such a programme be, than the minutiae of scholarship which now unhappily occupy practically the whole time of our graduate students in the classics! *Vivat Bonamicus Actensis* and the cause he stands for!

F. A. P.

Homer, Virgil, Chaucer are dead only in a very unimportant sense.—R. D. Welch

Vitruvius—Architect or Theorist?

GREGORY H. JACOBMEYER, S.J.
St. Louis University High School

One does not read long in any book on Roman architecture before the name of Vitruvius appears. By the very brevity of the reference one wonders: Who is this man? When did he live? What did he do? What is his contribution to the field of architecture? Very often such references as, "according to Vitruvius," or "as Vitruvius says," give the impression that he is the great authority on classical architecture. Why he should be so considered, we shall discuss here.

When Marcus Vitruvius Pollio lived, and where he lived, is still a matter of doubt. Apart from the references in his own treatise, he is mentioned by Pliny. Even though Vitruvius wrote the *De Architectura* in Rome, there is nothing to prove that he was a native of Rome. Some scholars presume that he was from the neighborhood of Formiae because of inscriptions found there. It seems that he lived during the reign of Augustus rather than that of Titus, because there were many beautiful buildings erected during the time of Titus which are not mentioned by Vitruvius. His special mention of the theatre of Pompey as the only one of stone in Rome confirms the opinion that he was a contemporary of Augustus.

The *De Architectura* of Vitruvius consists of ten books of which the third and fourth deal with temple architecture. We shall limit our observations to these two books.

The fame of Vitruvius is to a great extent due to the Renaissance. His was the only professed architectural work handed down from Roman days, and so the men of the Classical Revival were eager to employ the canons laid down by him.

In speaking of Roman architecture we must remember that the architecture even of the Empire was fundamentally Hellenistic, but the centralization of government had an immense effect on new construction and design. The architects were most probably mainly Greeks, but the engineers, who gradually introduced new methods, were very probably Romans.

Vitruvius seems to have leaned heavily on the works of Greek architects of his own day as well as of earlier times, and we shall see that he apparently was greatly influenced by Hellenistic proportions and construction.

It is thought that Vitruvius furnished some figures at the end of the various books, but none of these are extant. As a result, there are a number of passages that present real difficulties, and it is usually in these sections that the commentaries afford very little help.

At the beginning of the Third Book, Vitruvius states that the planning of temples depends upon symmetry, which in turn arises from proportion. "Proportion consists in taking a fixed module, in each case, both for the parts of a building and for the whole, by which the method of symmetry is put into practice." (Vitr. 3.1, p. 159)* Proportion was to consist in the common measurements existing between the whole and its separate parts; a harmony of ratios of the parts with the whole. In temple architecture the major ratio in plan was the cella; in elevation, the facade and sides. When the plan of the temple had been sketched, Vitruvius derived the common measure or module by dividing the breadth

of the stylobate into a definite number of parts. This module was the diameter of the column at the base. From the diameter of the column the height of the bases and capitals was determined; while from the height of the columns was to be derived the height of the architrave, frieze, and cornice. However, he did not employ exclusively the module obtained from the width of the stylobate. Often he compared the adjacent parts of a building. For example, the heights of moldings are stated as fractions of the members to which they belong.

The proportions of the intercolumniations are derived from the column diameter. Vitruvius gives each type of intercolumniation a special name. . . . "So then pycnostyle is that in the intercolumniations of which the thickness of a column and a half can be interposed. . . . The systyle also is that in which the thickness of two columns can be placed in the intercolumniations, . . . These two kinds are objectionable in use. For when matrons come up the steps to give thanks, they cannot approach between the columns arm in arm but in single file; further, the view of the doors is taken away by the numerous columns, and the statues themselves are obscured; walking around the temple is hindered on account of the narrow intervals." (Vitr. 3.3, p. 171) All these objections would be valid only if applied to small temples. Furthermore, Vitruvius would necessarily be forced to find fault with the Parthenon, since its intercolumniations are less than one and one half diameters.

"Of the diastyle, the arrangement is as follows: when we can interpose the thickness of three columns in the intercolumniations. . . . Such a disposition presents this difficulty, that the architraves break because of the wide openings." (Vitr. 3.3, p. 173) There is one more type of intercolumniation mentioned by Vitruvius, which he calls the "eustyle." For him this is the ideal system. It consists of an intercolumniation of two and a quarter column diameters with the width of three diameters for the middle intercolumniations on the front and back. Vitruvius states that he derives this system of column-spacing from Hermogenes, the architect of the temple of Dionysus at Teos and that of Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia. These temples owe their fame less to their intrinsic merits than to the general belief that their architect was the chief authority of Vitruvius. Perhaps he obtained some of his information from Hermogenes' book or books on these temples, but this classification of column spacings, bears little relation to ancient architectural practices. It is true that during Hellenistic times the matter of column-spacing changed greatly. The intercolumniations became wider and the middle ones wider still. However, it was the general practice to span this wide central space by an arch, thus changing completely the appearance of the facade. Vitruvius mentions nothing of using an arch to span the middle intercolumniation of the eustyle system. If the diastyle (three diameters) was unsuited because of the danger of the architraves breaking, how will he span the middle intercolumniation of the eustyle which is also three diameters, and directly under the gable, the point where the greatest weight is concentrated?

This eustyle system seems to be purely theoretical and for the most part without basis in fact. The measurements of Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman temples of the

various periods, manifest not even a trace of such a system, and reveal, on the contrary, a variety of spacing that indicates the freedom of architects from such mechanical formulae.

Vitruvius also offers definite, but far from complete, proportions for the floor plan of the cella and whole temple. The temple is to be twice as long as it is wide, while the cella and portico together are to form a rectangle of a two to one ratio. However, the author does not mention where the measurements are to be taken, and this (to mention only one), presents a real difficulty when the peripteral temples are considered. Hexastyle temples are to have eleven columns on the side and octostyle are to have fifteen. It is true, this arrangement is the nearest possible approach to a two to one ratio, but it is mathematically impossible to produce a stylobate of exactly these proportions without abandoning the principle of the equality of all intercolumniations. However, I have found that if the measurements are taken at the axes of the corner columns, a perfect two-to-one ratio is always attained with the six-by-eleven and eight-by-fifteen arrangement of columns. This ratio of two to one would naturally be disturbed by using the eustyle system of a wide middle intercolumniation proposed by Vitruvius.

In this matter of proportion of length to width we again see how Vitruvius was influenced by Hellenistic architecture. In Hellenistic times there seems to have been a preference for an approximation of the two-to-one ratio, but all through Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman architecture there are so many variations that to try to form any sort of rule for proportion is impossible.

The Doric entablature described by Vitruvius offers views in striking contrast to rules held sacred by the Greeks. The first rule was that one triglyph must stand over each column; the second, that the two triglyphs which stand over each of the four corner columns must be in contact; third, that every triglyph was to stand exactly over the center either of a column or an intercolumniation. The Greek architects did exactly what Vitruvius mentions as faulty. They first of all contracted the angle or corner intercolumniations and sometimes even the intercolumniation next to the angle. Since this was not sufficient in itself, we find that at least two of the triglyphs were shifted with the consequent widening of the metopes. Vitruvius considered such accommodations faulty, but his solution is a good example of the conclusions at which a theorist arrives. He wanted the angle triglyphs placed with exact symmetry over the angle columns, so that half a metope would finish off the corner, and as a result the temple angles would lack emphasis just where it was most needed. Architects do not necessarily aim at mathematical equality to solve a problem. Ictinus employed all the above contractions and extensions in the Parthenon, and there is nothing that seems out of place or disturbing.

There are a number of other points which because of their highly technical nature cannot be considered here.

At first one is deeply impressed by the lists of proportions which Vitruvius offers. However, as soon as an attempt is made to illustrate his proportions by means of drawings, many practical problems arise. His work, on analysis, gives the appearance of a compilation of numerous details from a variety of treatises on temple

architecture. Combining these with certain points that struck his fancy in temples that he considered great, he developed his ideal temple proportions.

Only a theorist would state the ideal temple (eustyle) would have its columns spaced two and a quarter diameters apart, with three diameters as the middle intercolumniation; whereas an architect would consider the size of the temple and the columns, the weight and strength of the architrave and other points of a practical nature. It makes quite a difference to an architect whether his columns are five feet in diameter with intercolumniations of over eleven feet, or columns of two feet with intercolumniations of four and a half feet. To the theorist it is merely an ideal proportion of two and a quarter to one.

Set rules and proportions as proposed by Vitruvius might be guiding norms, but they would only hamper a true artist and architect, if he were expected to follow them closely. Size, purpose, location, materials, are all modifying influences, and it is the task of the artist to blend these into a dynamic whole.

In brief, it is our opinion that the *De Architectura* reflects the rationalizing and classifying attitude of a man in a library, not a workshop.

*Frank Granger, *Vitruvius, On Architecture* (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1931: 2 vols.) (Loeb Classical Series). Page references are to Vol. 1.

The Club's The Thing!

SISTER MARY CONCEPTA, R.S.M.

Mt. St. Mary's Academy, Little Rock, Arkansas

The chattering of seventy-five sophomores hung in mid-air as the gavel sounded and the Consul requested that the meeting come to order. It was eleven-forty, all of a Thursday morning in bright October. But how squeeze a Latin club meeting into a twenty-five minute activity period? Only a Roman Consul could find such a neat solution! What is she saying? For here at St. Mary's, all club officials, even to the Pontifex Maximus, are girls.

To save time usually consumed in calling the roll, the Censor has checked the membership against the attendance records in the Office.

Then, turning to the Quaestor or treasurer, the Consul called for the report. With all the assurance of a seasoned financier, the Quaestor announced that the S. P. Q. R. Club treasury held the startling total of twenty-five dollars. Satisfied nods and smiles greeted the report, even when the official added,

Now, all you citizens of the Roman State who haven't paid your dues, hurry up! The deadline is October 30. You see, we of the Roman Senate—this with a gracious smile directed toward the officers grouped around the table—have to know how much we can spend.

After this business had been disposed of to the satisfaction of Senate and Roman People alike, the Consul introduced the most important item on the agenda, namely, the matter of sponsoring a Roman movie for the school.

Discreetly seated in the rear of the room, the writer thoroughly enjoyed the lively discussion that followed. What would the movie cost? Who played the lead in

The Last Days of Pompeii? Was it an old-fashioned silent or a talkie? Was it an old film that would need patching every fifty feet or so? And what was the film about? Such a barrage would have floored anyone but a Roman Consul! For once, she knew all the answers. The picture, a seven reel, 16mm. film, could be rented from the Film Classic Exchange, Fredonia, N. Y., for fifteen dollars, exclusive of express charges. Maria Cordo, a top-flight Italian actress, played the lead. No, it's not an old-fashioned silent but a sound-picture in excellent condition. And what was the picture about? Why, hadn't they ever heard of the book, "The Last Days of Pompeii," by Edward Bulwer-Lytton?

We have it in the library—three copies, in fact. What's it about? Well, last week didn't we read that letter of Pliny telling about the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius which buried Herculaneum and Pompeii? Now we can see it all in the picture. Then there's the fascinating story of the struggle and ultimate victory of Christianity in pagan Pompeii. Oh, yes, you'll see the early Christian martyrs in the arena. You'll learn lots about Roman life but painlessly. The dialog's all in English.

Thus finished the consul triumphantly. Thereupon a motion was carried to sponsor the showing of the picture on November 12. To advertise the attraction, several members volunteered to make posters, the three best to be selected by the Senate. At this juncture, the buzzer announced the end of the period. Rather hurriedly the august gathering was adjourned. Lunch was in the offing!

In addition to the showing of films having a classical background, there are numerous other activities which the writer has seen carried on, here and elsewhere, with a fair degree of success. Perhaps nothing constitutes so direct a challenge to students and sponsor alike as the decision on the part of the Aedile or program chairman to stage a Latin skit. From the *Service Bureau for Classical Teachers*, with headquarters at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, this club has secured many skits, both Latin and English, all of which have proved very popular with the members. Better still, second and even some first year students have written short dialogs on subjects that tie up with school life and have presented their effort before the club. Recently the six weeks' tests and the study necessary to pass, as well as the victories of the basketball team, have afforded timely material for a few questions and answers in Latin. After all, if students see that Latin can be used to convey twentieth-century ideas, they acquire, sooner or later, a healthy respect for the language. The very notion of "talking Latin," albeit haltingly, possesses a mighty appeal for high-schoolers. Currently, members holding an "A" or "B" Latin average are not only writing a skit in English, but have collaborated in turning out a not-too-unclassical version of a perennial favorite, "Little Red Ridinghood," both skits to be presented during *National Latin Week*, April 20-27.

The Latin background of various trade-names is also grist for the Latin club mill. Vocabulary games not only furnish enjoyment but also give some much-needed extra drill. A prize offered to the member who writes within a given time the greatest number of Latin words, using only the letters found in "Saturnalia," is a pleasant way of emphasizing the need of learning vocabularies.

Latin songs are always welcome at club meetings.

"Carmina Latina," (Thrift Press, Ithaca), contains a good selection; others are available at the *Service Bureau*.

Talks on various phases of Roman life, such as food, dress, homes, transportation, religion, marriage and burial customs, architecture, and countless others are always interesting. Incidentally, the writer has used many times the notes taken in the courses on Roman Antiquities and Roman Religion conducted by Doctor Korfmacher at St. Louis University.

Students like seasonal programs at the meetings. At the December session, the reading of the Gospel in Latin from the first Mass of Christmas was followed by five carols in Latin. Then came a short play in Latin, "Io Saturnalia," with its interesting Roman holiday customs. Valentine favors were a surprise feature of the February 14 meeting. After paying tribute to the Roman Martyr of the day, and then telling the story of Cupid and Psyche, a group of students acted out a Roman wedding, while an explanatory script was read by the Aedile. The Ides of March will feature a "Caesar Quiz," which appeared in a recent issue of *The Classical Journal*, and a short musical comedy, "The Death of Julius Caesar." Costumes for the plays are whipped up on short notice—almost conjured up! "What we can't do with a length of cheesecloth, a sheet, and a piece of ribbon isn't worth mentioning," was the way a student put it recently.

As for club dues, members here pay fifty cents per year. The organization is definitely *not* an "eating club"; it is generally understood that the dues are used to purchase equipment for the department. This year the club has purchased four large framed pictures for the Latin room.

Members who maintain an "A" or "B" average in Latin for one semester are allowed to wear the silver pin of the *Junior Classical League*. This entitles a student to twenty-five points toward the hundred required for the S. F. Q. R. ribbon awarded in the club. Points are granted for such activities as reporting on books having a classical background, taking part in Latin plays, arranging bulletin-board displays, and "selling" Latin to eighth grade students.

Doubtless any sponsor could add endlessly to this paper of "what-to-do's." The main thing is for the sponsor to stay in the background as much as possible. If the club is to mean anything, it must be the expression of student interest in Latin—interest which, once kindled, the sponsor should unobtrusively fan into steady flame by every legitimate means in her power.

Failure Among the Greeks

ELLENOR SWALLOW
Barnard College, Columbia University

Honour, renown, and the immortality which is gained by prowess are so much to the fore in the Greek poets that we readily forget about the man who failed to attain distinction, or rather, the man who tried and failed. Yet obviously there were many such. Livingstone writes of the Greeks in this connexion: "They do not admire and exalt failure [in the fashion of the "poetry of failure"], they do not disguise it: they look at it far too directly to do either the one or the other. With an infinite sense of tragedy, their literature goes forward

on its splendid way, passing inexorably by the dying, leaving the wounded to lie where they fall, offering no consolation to the mourner."¹ How abundantly true this is, for instance, of the *Iliad*! Yet death and wounds, with which Homer is so much concerned there, are in a sense a specialized form of failure, and, certainly in the scenes which depict the onrush of battle, the poet will hardly stop to express his sentiments about every man who falls. Where there is more than a factual statement,² Homer inclines to be gentle.³ So we get a large impression that, as the poet was kindly but clear-eyed, so also were his auditors. Yet consider the Dolon story. While the poet is so much pre-occupied with the success of Diomedes and Odysseus that he makes no direct comment on Dolon's failure in his mission, we have already been given a picture of the man which hardly calls up much respect for him.⁴ The opinion that the poet himself had formed of him is used to prejudice us.⁵ This perhaps gives a somewhat clearer insight into what was the Greek attitude in general towards failure, that is, towards individual failures.

A few other passages of various sorts build up the picture more fully:

Then with mocking words didst thou speak to him, knight Patroclus: "Hah, look you, very nimble is the man; how lightly he diveth! In sooth if he were on the teeming deep, this man would satisfy many by seeking for oysters leaping from his ship were the sea never so stormy, seeing that now on the plain he diveth lightly from his car. Verily among the Trojans too there be men that dive."⁶

Kebriones, Hector's current charioteer, is the victim and the subject of these unpleasant words. He has failed in his task of war, and the Greek considered him therefore a legitimate target for mockery. This is, of course, mockery by his enemy, so that the hatred which is part of formal enmity is added to the natural scorn for a person who fails to accomplish what he has set out to do. There are many speeches of such mockery in the *Iliad*, none perhaps so grim as this. This impression of grimness is, moreover, greatly emphasized by the words falling from the mouth of one of the gentlest warriors in Homer, in whose makeup nowhere else is there any hint of cruelty or violence. Now this is just what the Greek warrior dreaded about battle—lest, in the event of his own failure, the world should jeer at his corpse or exult over his tomb, or, should he escape with his life, lest those at home also should turn away from him. Agamemnon is speaking:

But because of thee, O Menelaos, shall there be dread woe for me if thou should'st die and complete the span of thy life. And most dishonoured should I go back to thirsty Argos.⁷

There is a further illustration of failure's results (inspired by war but not necessarily confined to it perhaps) in the words of Andromache over Astyanax, when from the battlements she sees Hector's dead body dragged behind the chariot of Achilles:

The day of orphanhood makes a child quite unloved. And he hangs his head and wets his cheeks with tears. And being in want, the child approaches his father's comrades pulling one by the cloak and another by the *chiton*. And someone, of those that have any pity, holds forth a cup for him for a sip, and he moistens his lips—but he moistens not his palate. And one whose family flourishes on both sides drives him out from the feast striking him with his hands and laying reproaches on him: "Begone, such as you are, indeed, your father feasteth not amongst us."⁸

The father has, as it were, failed in his fatherhood, and no matter what the cause, his son pays the penalty of being treated, even by his father's friends, with scorn or, at best, indifference but poorly mixed with pity.

We note, however, one modifying element which arises with respect to war, because the Greeks recognized that the issues there involved might easily be settled even against the bravest; so that we usually find both sides qualifying their condemnation to this extent, that a brave man who has gone out to meet his fate is not, in sober moments, considered as a real failure even in death or defeat; real failure would be—not facing the enemy. So Homer:

My friends, be men, and take to you hearts of valour, and have shame each of the other in the fierce conflict. Of men that have shame more are saved than are slain, but from them that flee cometh neither glory nor any avail.⁹

And this setting apart of a man's success or failure in war as something rather different from the other issues of life continued to prevail, and in the fifth century Pindar writes for the Abderites:

If a man succouring his friends harshly encounters his enemies his toil, going down to the attack seasonably, brings peace.¹⁰

On the side of life not concerned with war, it is Pindar again who, somewhat unexpectedly, provides us with some picture of how the unsuccessful person was treated. He twice describes the lot of those who went home from the great games without a prize. In an ode for Alcideimon, a boy-wrestler, he speaks of the victor as one,

Who, by the fortune of the gods, nor yet failing in his manhood, put away from himself upon the limbs of four boys a hateful return with dishonouring speech and a quiet slinking home.¹¹

And again, to Aristomenes of Aegina:

And calculating evil thou didst fall upon four bodies to whom there was no happy returning like thine granted by judgment in Pythia, and when they came to their mothers, no merry laughter stirred up joy round about them, but along the alleyways aloof from enemies they went cowering, stung by their misfortune.¹²

These passages speak for themselves. They are brilliantly vivid pictures and, whether or not we like their implications, and whether we blame Pindar or not for setting them there in the midst of someone else's triumph-song, we cannot escape their meaning. Clearly, the man who did not win had better go and hide himself,—not just because of his own inner sense of shame and disappointment, but because he would be deliberately reminded of his ill-success by the taunts of his fellows. The same spirit is behind this as is behind the treatment of the orphaned child quoted above. Yet in the case of the orphan, he was not himself to blame; and in the case of the athlete, he has already shown skill, perseverance, and a measure of success in that he has, as we should say to-day, "reached the finals" in the championship bouts.¹³ As the orphan suffered from his father's death, so the family, and even the city, of the athlete will be dishonoured by the loser's mischance. It is only the winner among men for whom the poet can write:

He does not disgrace the hero-valour which was his by birth,

or again:

Whose famed assembly-place [Aegina's] Aristocleides, thanks to the destiny decreed by thee, did not stain with

disgrace by being weakened in the all-strong host of the panerion.¹⁴

One more passage, a fragment, comprehends the loser's mood:

Conquered men have by dead silence been held from going even into the presence of friends.¹⁵

It is quite true that in one victory ode, this time from Bacchylides, we find an attempt made to excuse a youth because he had not been declared victor at Olympia, as he has been on this occasion at Delphi:

Yea, and I declare that in the most divine plain of holy Pelops, by fair-flowing Alpheus, unless someone had turned aside the path of upright justice, his locks would have been crowned with the gray olive, the common hope of all.¹⁶

Bacchylides hastens to say that he does not intend to charge any individual with guileful practices, but blames only the course of chance, but whatever he blames, he is obviously anxious to turn away the disgrace from his patron as one personally responsible for the previous failure and to claim that the present victory proves his point and so wipes out the former ill. Apart from this hint, however, Bacchylides shows himself more polite than Pindar, for he makes no references to the rivals who have lost.

We should, however, turn to Homer once again for the account of the funeral games for Patroclus. The events there are simply though vividly recounted, and throughout they show a very good-natured performance. Chariot- and foot-races particularly are pertinent. After the former, Achilles proposes to give second prize to Eumelos, although he has come in last, to compensate for his bad luck in the breaking of the horses' yoke. Antilochus, to be sure, objects, for he covets the prize, which in fact he has won; and then in his turn he is challenged by Menelaos, who charges him with using guile instead of horsemanship. But despite the momentary flare-up of feelings, there seems little sign of ill-will throughout it all, or of any jeering or deep sense of disgrace. And the same is true of the foot-race. Aias takes second place to Odysseus after slipping in the slime of the sacrifice, and his comment upon receiving the second prize is:

"Go to! The goddess hindered my running, who in former times also just like a mother has stood by Odysseus, and helps him." So he spoke, but they all laughed merrily at him. Then Antilochus took away the last prize, smiling, and spoke a word to the Argives.¹⁷

His word is a graceful bow to his successful rivals and a compliment to Achilles. A very different spirit from the "dishonouring speech" in Pindar. Granted that two points, of course, might modify the tone. First, on the material side, through Achilles' courtesy, all participants bear away some sort of prize, so that the effort of no-one is left quite unrewarded. And second, the contest is staged by an individual and is for the glorification of a man known to and beloved by all, and so is in a sense "all in the family". Yet one cannot help wondering whether the increase of civilization had not already in the early fifth century brought something of professionalism with it which was beginning to crush out the more "heroic" sportsmanship of earlier days.

It is impossible to deal here with sentiments about failure as expressed by the tragedians, since they are there complicated by their subordination to the larger purposes of the several writers. Yet one passage may be cited which, by implication more than direct ex-

pression, well sums up a certain way of thinking among the Greeks. In the *Persae* Atossa attempts to estimate what will be the situation of Persia if her ill-omened visions of the night should come to pass and Xerxes be defeated. She reminds the elders that even though he may fail in his expedition to overthrow and subjugate Greece, yet because he is an absolute ruler, this misfortune will not affect his position.¹⁸ This was how Aeschylus and his fellow-Greeks interpreted absolutism, and they were proud, because they felt that it could not happen in Greece, where, if a man of influence or power failed, his failure meant his downfall. As Pindar reminded one of his athletes:

It is the men that are successful who always look wise even to their fellow-citizens.¹⁹

This was not just the pious utterance of some pessimist, but the recognition of an active fact in Greek life. As the Greek was full of high praise and adulation for the man of achievement (in any realm), in the zeal of his enthusiasm he became actually cruel towards anyone who did not measure up to that one outstanding person, rejecting even near-success with a scorn or mockery that to our civilization would seem, at best, to be poor taste or lack of sportsmanship. In war he recognized that a higher element entered in, and so, when he had returned to a soberer frame of mind, conceded that his jibes must be reserved for the coward. But in the works of peace there was less restraint: you were a winner, or unwelcome and made to feel so.

The present paper does not pretend to be an exhaustive examination of this subject; but even so far as it goes it serves to show that we must beware of being carried away by the great sweep of Greek literature, and thereby of failing to notice that the Greeks were not so much an ideally perfect people, as a very human race with failings as well as virtues. And their failings do not always make very attractive material for consideration. This is not to depreciate the Greeks; it is an effort to strike an honest balance between the halo of idealism with which their poetry tends to surround them and the rather more sobering facts that are all too readily left to one side because they appear only in passing, and are swept away by the tide of the triumph-song.

¹ Livingstone, R. W. *The Greek Genius and its Meaning to Us*, Oxford, 2nd ed. 1915, p. 97.

² An example taken at random: "But he wounded Kromios full on the breast with his spear. And he fell with a thud and the other stripped the armour from his shoulders." (*Iliad* XV 523-4) I take the responsibility for translations unless otherwise indicated.

³ "And he came after Xanthos and Thoon, Sons of Phainops, both his darlings, but he was worn out by mournful age and begat not any other sons to leave over his possessions. These then the other slew and took away the very life from both, leaving to their father groans and mournful woe, for he did not receive them returning alive out of battle; and distant kinsmen shared his property." (*ibid.* V 153-8)

⁴ Although acknowledging that Dolon is rich in possessions and swift of foot, Homer calls him ugly and shows him as insistent on an oath from Hector, not just his announced promise, as the reward for spying (*ibid.* X 316 and 321-3). And we might add the account of his easy yielding to the two warriors from the Greek camp: "And he stood, and shook in his dread, and in his mouth his teeth chattered and he was pale from fear." (374-6)

⁵ Something of the same spirit is to be found in the Thersites episode (*ibid.* II 211 sqq.) although that is concerned with clash of class interests rather than success or failure in an undertaking, as is the Doloneia.

⁶ *ibid.* XVI 744-750, tr. A. T. Murray, Loeb Classical Library.

⁷ *ibid.* IV 169-171.

⁸ *ibid.* XXII 490-8.

⁹ *ibid.* V 529-532, and, with a slight change of wording in the first line, XV 563-6, tr. A. T. Murray.

¹⁰ Pindar, *frag.*, Paeon II 21-2, Oxford Classical Texts, ed. C. M. Bowra.

¹¹ *id.* Ol. VIII 67-9.

¹² *id.* *Pyth.* VIII 81-7. It happens that both these references to unsuccessful contestants occur in odes celebrating victories in wrestling, but this is surely mere coincidence and would not show anything different from the general spirit with which any loser was treated.

¹³ Apparently the wrestling matches began with sixteen competitors, who were reduced successively to eight and then four and then two, and the winner in this last match was the victor who had thus successfully overcome four others.

¹⁴ *id.* *Isth.* III 13-4, and *Nem.* III 15-7 respectively. The "three" referred to here is the Muse.

¹⁵ *id.* *frag.* 216.

¹⁶ Bacchylides, *Ep.* X 24-9.

¹⁷ *Iliad* XXIII 782-6.

¹⁸ Aeschylus, *Persae* 211-4.

¹⁹ Pindar, *Ol.* V 18.

The Henle Latin Series

It was just ten years ago that the *Henle Latin Series* was first offered to the high schools. Since many readers of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN are actually teaching the series, they may be interested to learn something of its fortunes during this first decade.

According to a statement of the publishers (Loyola University Press), the books are now being used in 26 Jesuit and in 405 non-Jesuit high schools of the United States. They are also used in Jesuit schools in British Honduras and in the British West Indies. And since the war, over 1100 copies of the books have been sold in the Philippines.

We remember that the edition of 1937 was not presented as final and complete. At the time the author promised a revision after further research to determine the frequency of words and their various forms in the reading matter set for the course and after a systematic testing of the books in a large number of scattered high schools. This promise is nearing its fulfillment. Guided by the results of the studies and tests as well as by the suggestions of numerous teachers, the Grammar and the books of the first three years have been thoroughly revised and are already in use; while the revised *Fourth Year Latin* is in preparation and will be available next fall.

The series, therefore, has proved itself. This should be of comfort and encouragement to the interested and conscientious teacher of Latin. The books are thoroughly modern in the sense that they employ the sound teaching devices that present-day pedagogy offers. At the same time, they retain the traditional methods and objectives of the high-school Latin course: they aim to teach Latin as a language; to give a thorough grounding in Latin through the mastery of forms and rules and vocabulary by way of drilling, testing, and reviewing; they try to make grammar and literature instruments of formation and education by disciplining and enriching the mind and heart of the student. The teacher may sometimes wonder whether he is struggling alone in the pursuit of this ideal. The widespread use of the *Henle Latin Series* is reassuring. Not everyone is giving up. The fort still has its numerous and staunch defenders. *Tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito.*

As for the future of the series, *Crescat eundo!*

H. J. G.

Book Review

Early Christian Epitaphy from Athens. By John S. Creaghan, S.J. and A. E. Raubitschek. Woodstock, Md., Theological Studies. 1946. Pp. 54, 10 plates. \$2.50.

We have in this book the beginning of a work of collection which has long been needed. In the matter of a 'Corpus' of Christian inscriptions of the early centuries, Greek is much less advanced than Latin. So we must welcome this modest contribution as a step forward in a laborious undertaking which will probably take many years to complete.

The limitations and handicaps under which this work was prepared must be kept in mind if we are to judge its value in the proper light. From remarks made here and there it is clear that the authors did not work on the originals, but for the most part with squeezes and with photographs of originals. Earlier publications were carefully searched and their contributions evaluated.

Our sources of information on the growth of Christianity in and about Athens are meagre in the extreme. As the work under discussion restricts itself to the funerary inscriptions, it can lift the veil only to a limited degree. Furthermore, though the title does not indicate it, only the epitaphs of the earliest centuries of Christianity fall within the scope of this undertaking. Of these, as numbered, thirty-three had been previously published and thirty-four are new. It is to be regretted that they are not all numbered in one series.

The chief worth of this undertaking lies in the fact that it brings together for the first time all known early epitaphs of primitive Athenian Christianity. With each the inventory number is carefully given, where it is known; earlier publication, wherever such exists, is exactly noted. Concise comments and descriptions are added. These are sober and conservative, for the most part; though some of the conjectural restorations are somewhat daring and improbable.

Two tables, one a concordance of the publications and the other an epigraphical index of names, will prove of value for further study and for reference. There is no indication of the place of discovery on the Plates, but this is given in the comments. The typographical and photographic work is excellent.

St. Mary's College,
St. Marys, Kansas

AUGUSTIN C. WAND, S.J.

The *St. Louis University Classical Club*, a student organization now in its nineteenth year and drawing its membership from the University and its senior corporate colleges, Fontbonne, Maryville, and Webster, is this season carrying out the following programme in connection with the Beta Zeta Chapter of Eta Sigma Phi:

Oct. 19: The Dawn of Greek Tragedy, with readings from the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus.

Nov. 16: The Noon and Evening of Greek Tragedy, with readings from the *Oedipus King* of Sophocles.

Dec. 14: The Splendor of Greek Comedy, with readings from the *Birds* of Aristophanes.

Feb. 15: Dramatic Beginnings at Rome, with readings from the *Trinummus* of Plautus.

Mar. 14: Dramatic Progress at Rome, with readings from the *Phormio* of Terence.

Apr. 18: Seneca and the Tradition of Classical Drama, with readings from Seneca's *Hercules Furens*.

S.
k,
s.

l-
of
s,
st
in
y

k
ge
re
on
d
re

-
e.
r-
d
e
-
e,
d
y

t
y
h
s
-
e
t
e

s
e
s
t,
l

.

t
s
e
s
-

a
a
a
a
a
a